

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
BIOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF WASHINGTON

A NEW CHAMOIS FROM THE APENNINES.

BY GERRIT S. MILLER, JR.

[By permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.]

The United States National Museum has recently procured, through the firm of Wilhelm Schlüter of Halle, Germany, two skins and skulls of *Rupicapra* from the Etruscan Apennines in the region of Mount Comero and the headwaters of the Savio River. They were at first supposed to represent *Rupicapra ornata*, but more careful examination shows that they have none of the peculiarities of the Abruzzian chamois. While agreeing with the alpine animal in erectness of the horns and in the color pattern of the neck and throat, they differ so noticeably in size of both incisiform teeth and cheek teeth from the eleven specimens of *Rupicapra rupicapra* with which I have compared them that there seems to be no reason to doubt that they represent a peculiar local form. This may be known as:

*Rupicapra fæsula* sp. nov.

*Type*.—Adult male (skin and skull) No. 174,943 U. S. National Museum. Passo Mandrioli, headwaters of the Savio River, Florence, Italy, September, 1911.

*Diagnosis*.—Similar to *Rupicapra rupicapra* (Linnaeus), but teeth noticeably larger, the length of maxillary row 62-64 mm. instead of 56.6 to 59 mm., that of mandibular row 64 to 68 mm. instead of 57 to 61.4 mm.

*Measurements*.—Type (m<sup>3</sup> moderately worn): Head and body, 1330; tail, 40; hind foot, 340; ear from crown, 115; condylobasal length of skull, 190.4 (197)\*; zygomatic breadth, 85.4 (84.2); greatest breadth across orbits, 105.6 (107.4); mastoid breadth, 56.6 (58.0); nasal, 61.0

\* Measurements in parenthesis are those of a male with m<sup>3</sup> slightly worn.

(66.0); greatest breadth of both nasals together, 23.6 (20.6); mandible, 159.4 (162.0); maxillary toothrow, 62.2 (64.0); mandibular toothrow, 64.0 (68.0).

*Remarks.*—The differences in size are clearly shown both by the actual measurements of the individual teeth, and by the area of the crown considered as a parallelogram. In the following table the teeth of the two specimens of *Rupicapra fœsula* are compared with those of three adult males of *R. rupicapra* (the largest in the collection) and an adult male of *R. pyrenaica*.

*Rupicapra fœsula.*

Number.	m <sup>1</sup> .	m <sup>2</sup> .	Upper premolars.
174943	13.0×10.4=135.2	14.6×10.4=151.8	25.2
174957	13.2×9.4=124.1	14.2×9.8=139.1	24.8
Number.	m <sub>1</sub> .	m <sub>2</sub> .	Lower premolars.
174943	11.2×6.6=73.9	13.4×6.8=91.1	20.0
174957	11.8×6.4=75.5	14.8×6.2=91.8	22.6

*Rupicapra rupicapra.*

Number.	m <sup>1</sup> .	m <sup>2</sup> .	Upper premolars.
882	12.4×8.6=106.6	12.6×8.6=108.4	22.6
4360	10.8×10.0=108.0	12.4×10.0=124.0	23.2
175016	12.0×8.2=104.0	13.0×8.0=104.0	23.6
Number.	m <sub>1</sub> .	m <sub>2</sub> .	Lower premolars.
882	10.8×6.0=64.8	13.0×5.6=72.8	19.4
4360	9.2×6.6=60.7	12.4×6.6=81.8	19±
175016	10.4×6.2=64.5	13.0×6.2=80.6	20.2

*Rupicapra pyrenaica.*

Number.	m <sup>1</sup> .	m <sup>2</sup> .	Upper premolars.
174607	12.0×8.0=96.0	13.0×8.2=106.6	21.6
Number.	m <sub>1</sub> .	m <sub>2</sub> .	Lower premolars.
174607	10.8×6.2=66.9	13.0×6.0=78.0	20.0

The teeth are relatively as well as actually larger than in *Rupicapra rupicapra*. In two adult males of the former the ratio of upper toothrow to condylobasal length of skull is 29.1 and 30.5. In the two males of *R.*

*fsula* it is 32.1 and 32.5. The ratios of mandibular toothrow to length of mandible in the same specimens are: *R. rupicapra*, 37.7 and 37.9; *R. fsula*, 40.1 and 41.3. In the incisiform teeth the same difference in size is evident on comparison though not easy to express by definite measurements.

In color *Rupicapra fsula* closely agrees with *R. rupicapra*. Both specimens are in the short summer coat in which *R. ornata* is figured by Neumann. Neither shows the slightest tendency, as in *ornata* and *pyren-aica*, for the pale throat area to extend downward on the neck.